



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

our mortal pilgrimage, until we reach the true land of promise, our heavenly home. I cannot believe, Mr. Editor, that the figure is better than the thing it represents. St. Paul tells us, on the contrary, that the old law had nothing but a shadow of the good things to come—see Heb. x. That all its sacrifices and sacraments were but weak and “beggarly elements”—Gal. iv. 9. And, “they were annulled, by reason of their weakness and unprofitableness”—Heb. vii. 18.

Now, Mr. Editor, if the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is nothing but bread and wine, according to Protestant doctrine, it is evident that the figure (manna) is far better than the thing prefigured; for manna came from heaven; bread comes from an oven. Manna had a delicious taste, and was in many respects miraculous; our bread is a common and natural food.

I must defer other proofs of Transubstantiation until next month. Hoping you will give this letter a place in your number for August,

I remain your very humble servant,

WILLIAM ROURKE.

We must say that we think Mr. Rourke would have done better to omit his complaints as to the offensive tone of our last reply. We have undertaken to say nothing in this journal which shall reasonably give offence to anybody; but, of course, we cannot undertake that none of our readers shall take offence, since that is a matter which depends on them, and not on us. Mr. Rourke does not accuse us of having imputed to him any wrong motive, or applied to him any insulting epithet. The substance of his complaint is, that we called the doctrines against which we were arguing, “Romish” doctrines. And pray, is there any good reason why we should not? We could not call those doctrines Catholic doctrines, because we claim to hold ourselves the Catholic doctrine on the Eucharist, and if we thought that the doctrine taught by the Church of Rome was the Catholic doctrine, we should hold it too. Which doctrine is the Catholic doctrine is a matter of opinion, on which Mr. Rourke holds one opinion, and we another; but which doctrine is the Romish doctrine, or, in other words, the doctrine taught by the Church of Rome, is a matter of fact on which there is no dispute whatever. We should be glad if there were more Irish Catholics who, like ourselves, would consider it an affront to be called Roman Catholics, but as Mr. Rourke does not consider his connection with the Church of Rome any disgrace, we repeat that we cannot call his burst of indignation well judged. Our Protestant readers will, probably, only laugh at it, and not believe he is in earnest; while nothing can be more advantageous to us than that those who wish to accuse us of “insult, outrage, and invective” should be seen to have no better foundation for their charge than that we have sometimes called the doctrines taught by the Church of Rome, for the sake of brevity, Romish, instead of Roman Catholic, doctrines. To avoid, however, giving offence to Mr. Rourke, we shall in future study if possible to call the doctrines of the Church of Rome “Roman Catholic,” and not by the shorter description of “Romish,” doctrines.

Little as we dreamed of offending Mr. Rourke by our last answer, we had still less idea that we were running away from discussing his quotations from the Fathers. Why, we gave him quotations, of which he has never taken any notice, and we discussed fully enough, as we conceived, all of his quotations which we were able to find in the authors from whom he professed to have taken them. The whole extent of our offence on this head was, that we asked Mr. Rourke to give us chapter and verse for his quotations, and to give us such references as would enable us to find them in the works of the Fathers where he professed to have found them. Why has not Mr. Rourke complied with our request?

Mr. Rourke next brings a charge of mistranslation against the Authorized Version of the Bible, and we think we have some reason to complain, and if we were inclined to take offence, might not unreasonably do so, at the tone and language in which, while he disclaims any profound acquaintance with the language of the original, he dogmatically pronounces it to be a false and corrupt translation of the Word of God, and asserts that our “first Reformers cooked that text, as they did many more in the Sacred Volume, to suit their own vile purposes.”

We seriously ask Mr. Rourke whether this sentence is quite in conformity with his boast that “if he were arguing for twenty years he would never utter a word derogatory to the dictates of Christian charity?”

We cannot help thinking that, according to the dictates of true charity, before bringing such a charge, it would not have been out of place to refer to the original and try whether the charge could be maintained; for otherwise the accusation only recoils on him who makes it, and shows that while Mr. Rourke thinks he is only at variance with the Protestant translators of the Bible, the truth is, he is at issue with St. Luke himself. Mr. Rourke himself confesses that by the principles of common sense, if the words of St. Luke have been rightly translated in the Authorized Version, then it will be necessary to abandon the method of interpretation which deduces the doctrine of transubstantiation from the words of institution, as recorded by St. Matthew and St. Mark. The matter is thus brought to a very simple question—Is the passage of St. Luke rightly translated or not? and this can be easily brought to the test.

The original Greek of Luke xxii., 20, is as follows:—“Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον, ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου, τὸ ὑπερ ὅλων ἐκχυνόμενον.”

The Authorized Version, or Protestant Bible—“This cup is the New Testament in my blood which is shed for you.”

It appears to us that nothing can be more literal than this translation. Will Mr. Rourke tell us in what particular it is an erroneous one, and if he cannot do so, what then becomes of the charge of “cooking.”

Lastly, Mr. Rourke refers to the Old Testament, and argues from three types of our Lord therein contained, viz., “The Paschal Lamb, the Blood of the Testament, and the Manna.” The argument is:—These objects were types of our Lord: the Paschal Lamb and the Manna were eaten by the people, therefore the flesh of the Lord is eaten in the Sacrament. Now, without pausing to say that this conclusion is not inconsistent with the Church of England doctrine on this subject, it is sufficient here to remark that the whole method of argument is most precarious. This will at once appear from the ease with which the argument can be retorted. Mr. Rourke cites three types—the Paschal Lamb, the Blood of the Testament, and the Manna. Now, might not we as reasonably argue: the Blood of the Testament was a type of the Blood of our Lord, but the Blood of the Testament was never drunk, therefore the Blood of our Lord is not received in the Sacrament.

And certainly the fact that the drinking of blood was absolutely forbidden by the Jewish law is a strong presumptive argument that the Apostles did not interpret the words of institution with regard to the cup in the gross and carnal sense in which modern theology has understood them.

BLACK HERETICS AND WHITE HERETICS.

[We recommend our readers to compare this letter carefully with the article “Who are heretics,” in our last number, page 78; EDITOR.]

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

YOUR HONOUR.—Sure it's long since I wrote you a letter; but I learned so much out of the last LAYMAN, I want to know if I took it right; I mean in regard of what the Rev. Mr. Neville and the Rev. Dr. Murray, of Maynooth, says about the Protestants being heretics. Sure, if all's true they said, it's a pity that the priests would keep such knowledge all to themselves; and, only that your honour put it in the LAYMAN, it's little the people would know about it at all.

Sure, the Rev. Mr. Neville and Dr. Murray has made it plain that there is two kinds of heretics, and the one kind is heretics all out, and the other kind is not heretics at all; and it's the last kind of heretics that the Protestants is. You see, your honour, these great knowledgeable clergy of Maynooth, that teaches all the young priests, lays it down that a man that goes astray, after what he knows is astray, is a formal heretic, and he comes in for all the sin and punishment of heresy; and sure that's very fair; and the man that goes astray, not thinking it's astray, is only a material heretic, and that's no sin at all, it seems; and sure that's very fair too; for the Rev. Mr. Neville says—“A material heretic, as far as the matter of faith is regarded, is guilty of no sin.”

Now, your honour, a plain man like me is apt to be bothered with hard words like *formal* and *material*, that is only fit for the clergy; but still we understand the differ itself well enough, when Mr. Neville is so good as to explain that a *material* heretic is one that thinks his own notions is right, and that a *material* heretic is guilty of no sin in holding what he thinks is right. But since the names is hard, maybe plain people wouldn't be far off the real thing in calling the one sort *black* heretics, and the other sort *white* heretics; and, if your honour pleases, I'll call them that way, for I'm only a plain man. Your honour sees that the *black* heretics is them that knows they are wrong, and still sticks to it; and sure no one would say a word for them; and the *white* heretics is them that believes that things is right and true; and sure we may call them white, when the Rev. Mr. Neville himself says that these heretics is *guilty of no sin*.

Now, your honour, it's a great thing for the likes of me to learn this differ; for I've been to chapel these forty years, and I never heard the priest say a word about the differ, when he would be saying that all Protestants is heretics; and, more forby, when man, woman, and child in the parish is calling the Protestants “heretics,” thinking it the worst name at all, there isn't one of them that knows the differ between *black* heretics and *white* heretics; and how would we, if your honour didn't tell us what the Rev. Mr. Neville said? So it would be a great thing if your honour would tell us the learned things that the knowledgeable priests at Maynooth says.

But there's more and better behind; for sure Rev. Mr. Neville allows that Protestants mostly is only white heretics, and guilty of no sin; for sure he says, “They have not had the motives of credibility of the Catholic doctrines submitted so satisfactorily to their minds as to incur the formal crime of heresy;” and he says he *doesn't* think that the Queen and the Protestants is heretics; and

he says the Protestants may fairly be supposed to be not sinning or not contumacious (and doesn't that mean, they are white heretics?).

Now it's a great thing to know; for sure there is nothing makes such bad blood in the country, or makes people so unchristian-like, as all the Catholics saying that all the Protestants is damned for heretics. But, sure, if the Catholics knew that it is only *white* heretics they are to call the Protestants, there would be little harm done.

And there is only one thing that makes against it all; for Rev. Mr. Neville says, that if a man is *imprudent* that makes him a real black heretic, and brings him in for punishment. Now, sure enough, it is a mighty imprudent thing for a man like me to get himself called a heretic at all. There was Jemmy Bryan, that the priest said turned heretic, and was not to be beat coming home from market, and died five days after; and if imprudence made him a real heretic, why, what could the coroner's jury do only find a verdict of “served him right;” but sure, your honour, there must be some mistake about that, when the rest of what Rev. Mr. Neville says is so good, and, indeed, Dr. Murray says great things too (that it would be a pity would be lost on the people); for he says “the great mass of Protestants are free from the sin of heresy;” and he allows that the white heretics, or them that believes what they hold, are not heretics in the eyes of God; and then, your honour, why should they be heretics in the eyes of the priest?

And there is one thing mighty good again the *imprudence*, for Rev. Mr. Neville allows that none is *black* heretics but them that acts *irrationally*; that's them that has no sense nor reason about things no more nor the beasts; and that's the way with a deal of Catholics about their religion, that doesn't know the *why* or the *wherefore*; but your honour knows there is more reason about our religion in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN than ever we got afore from priest or parson. So it stands to reason that them that considers what is in the LAYMAN isn't acting *irrationally* anyway, and so they can't be black heretics at all for that.

But there is one thing I don't find, and will your honour get it for us, from Rev. Mr. Neville or Dr. Murray. Where does these white heretics go when they die? Sure a merciful God will not send them to hell for what is no sin? And since Rev. Mr. Neville says they are guilty of *no sin*, I don't see how they can be sent to Purgatory itself for that; and where will they go to, your honour?

And now, your honour, there is one thing more. Rev. Mr. Neville says that the motives of credibility of the Catholic doctrines has not been satisfactorily submitted to the minds of the Protestants. Now, 'deed I think that that's true. But, then, why don't the priests submit to the Protestants, in a satisfactory way, the reasons for believing the Catholic doctrine? Is it because they can't, or is it because it's better not? Well, it reminds me of what I once heard a man argify (and he called himself a Catholic, too): he said the heathens was better off nor us by knowing nothing about the Christian religion, because that left them without sin or unbelief, and if they knew it they might only get themselves damned by it. Now, I thought it answer enough to that to say it is the *Gospel of the grace of God*; and sure that can be no harm anyway. But I am not that clear now about the religion of the Church of Rome; for Rev. Dr. Murray says of the Protestants, that “immense numbers are not only free from the guilt of heresy, but even in a state of invincible and, therefore, inculpable ignorance.” Now, I asked the schoolmaster what is *invincible* and *inculpable*? and he said it was what they couldn't help, and so there was neither sin nor blame in it, and it would never be laid against them by God. And isn't that the fine way for the Protestants to be in? And it all comes of the priests holding their tongues, and not giving the Protestants satisfactory reasons for believing in the Church of Rome; and maybe that is just the reason why the priests won't give the reasons for their doctrines in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, when your honour asked them so often, because they know the Protestants would see them there, and it might do them harm.

But one thing bothers me entirely—it *can't* be good for a man not to know that the gospel of the grace of God is true; but Rev. Mr. Neville and Doctor Murray makes it out to be mighty good for the Protestants not to know that the doctrines of the Church of Rome is true; for sure that ignorance clears them of guilt and sin, and keeps them out of the way of damnation. But doesn't that make an ugly difference between the gospel of God and the priests' religion? And, then, I thought, maybe the Protestants would get off, because it was no fault of theirs; and maybe God will lay all the blame on the priests, that does not give the Protestants satisfactory reasons for believing in the Church of Rome. And then, again, I thought maybe it wouldn't be easy for the priests to do that same. Any way, your honour sees that Rev. Mr. Neville allows it *isn't* done.

There is one good thing, any way: the Catholics that read the LAYMAN needn't be one bit afraid of what it will do to them; for sure if they don't believe your honour's notions is right, they won't take up with them; but if they once come to be convinced that the things in the LAYMAN is right and true, then it's nothing more nor white heresy to believe them things, and them that believes the things is *guilty of no sin*. It's the best thing I heard yet.

Your honour's humble servant to command,
PAT MURRAY, of Westmeath.